

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY D	OCKET NO. CO	NFIRMATION NO.
10/662,847	09/15/2003	Alexander J. Roberts	GP-302	GP-302409 1208	
75	90 02/08/2006	i		EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER DEVRIES				KLEBE, GERALD B	
General Motors	Corporation				
Mail Code 482-C23-B21			ART U	NIT P	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 300			361	8	
Detroit, MI 48	3265-3000				

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/662,847	ROBERTS, ALEXANDER J.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Gerald B. Klebe	3618		

`	Gerald B. Klebe	3618						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 24 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the followances the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complian time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 106.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti F FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered b	ecause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co								
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below								
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	acted claims						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	-	ecteu ciaims.	ĺ					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s			(
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	explanation of					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3, 5-6, 8-10, and 12-16(refer to brid	ef explanation appended hereto).							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a Nord and sufficient reasons why the affidate	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:								
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	/.					
		(0,0)	1///					
	/ Il ricelle	11/1	YAM					
•	1/3 Nelse 31 January 2006	Z:::R'970						
		TO COMY						

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/662,847

Art Unit: 3618

Case Serial Number: 10/662847

Advisory Action in Response to Applicant's Amendment After Final filed 01/24/2006

CONTINUATION SHEET

In further explanation of item 7 as expressed on PTOL-303 stating that, for purposes of appeal

the proposed amendments filed 01/24/2006 would be entered, the following brief explanation of

how these amended claims would be rejected is provided:

Upon entry of the amendment filed 01/24/2006 Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-10, and 12-16 are

pending; claims 2, 4, 7, and 11 being cancelled by Applicant.

Applicant's arguments notwithstanding, claims 1, 3, and 5-6 drawn to a regenerative

braking system for a vehicle are rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Tamai et al.

(US 6307277) in view of Bhavsar et al. (US 6691807).

Applicant's arguments notwithstanding, claims 8-10 and 12, drawn to a method of

charging and discharging a battery in a vehicle are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious

over Tamai et al. (US 630277) in view of Bhavsar et al. (US 6691807).

Applicant's arguments notwithstanding, claims 13-16, drawn to a method of operating a

vehicle having a regenerative braking system are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious

over Tamai et al. (US 630277) in view of Bhavsar et al. (US 6691807).

Applicant's Remarks as filed 01/24/2006 will be fully addressed in detail to further

support the examiner's conclusions of rejections of the claims under 35 USC 103.

MATCOlle RK lehe / Art Unit 3618 / 31 January 2006